

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 12, 13, 16, 18 and 20 have been amended. Claims 12, 13, 16 and 18 were amended for reasons unrelated to patentability.

This amendment changes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-29 are now pending in this application.

Claim Objections

Claims 13 and 16 were objected to for informalities. In response, claims 13 and 16 have been amended to correct the informalities. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that the objections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 10, 11, and 20-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,400,940 ("Sennett"). In response, Applicants amend independent claim 20 and respectfully traverse the rejection for the reasons set forth below.

Applicants rely on M.P.E.P. § 2131, entitled "Anticipation – Application of 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b) and (e)" which states, "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Applicants respectfully submit that Sennett does not describe each and every element of independent claims 1, 12, 14 and 20.

Claim 1 is directed to a communication system for providing user assistance to an owner of a communication device. Claim 12 is directed to a method for providing user assistance to an owner of a communication device. Claim 14 is directed to a communication terminal for providing user assistance to an owner of a communication device. Finally, claim 20 is directed to a communication device configured to receive user assistance from a communication terminal.

As recited in the above-mentioned claims, the communication terminal has access to a database that stores operator instructions for performing functions with the communication device. The operator instructions are prescribed user input actions to be performed on the communication device. Upon user request, the communication terminal is configured to transmit these operator instructions to the communication device. Further, the communication terminal comprises a means to compare the operator instructions to actual user input to determine if the user has entered the operator instructions at the communication device correctly.

In contrast, Sennett does not disclose each and every element of independent claims 1, 12, 14 and 20. Sennett discloses a customized user line guide where a subscriber requests help via a terminal device and subsequently is provided with help information. (See Col. 2, line 67- Col. 3, line 12.) However, Sennett does not disclose, teach or suggest a communication system having a means to compare, or to enable comparison of, data representing actual user input actions, performed following output of the data representing the operator instructions, with the invocation instruction data to determine if the at least one function of the communication device has been invoked as claimed in claims 1, 12 and 14. Further, Sennett does not disclose, teach or suggest a communications device “configured to receive feedback on user input actions to determine whether or not the user has performed the correct actions” as claimed in claim 20.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that column 4, lines 33-46 of Sennett discloses the above-referenced claim limitations. However, the system disclosed in Sennett states that online help information is provided to a subscriber so that the subscriber may “compare the services and features offered by the system with the services and features

available through their (subscriber) mobile telecommunications provider.” In sum, Sennett provides information to a subscriber to allow the subscriber to compare the services of telecommunications providers. In contrast, the communications system of the present invention includes, a means to compare the operator instructions received by a user to actual user input to determine if the user has entered the operator instructions correctly. This feature is clearly different from that disclosed in Sennett. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 12, 14 and 20 are patentable over Sennett.

Further, concerning claim 20, Henry, Jr. fails to cure the deficiencies of Sennett. Therefore, for this additional reason Applicants submit that claim 20 is allowable. In addition, claims 2-10, 11-13, 15-19 and 21-29 depend from one of independent claims 1, 12, 14 or 20 and are therefore allowable for the reasons set forth above without regards to further patentable limitations contained therein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1-29 and that the claims be allowed.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account 08-2025 pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.25. Additionally, charge any fees to Deposit Account 08-2025 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 through § 1.21 inclusive, and any other sections in Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations that may regulate fees.

Respectfully submitted,

Date November 7, 2006

By  Reg. No. 59,396 /ffw

Telephone: (202) 672-5485

William T. Ellis
Registration No. 26,874